DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 074 198 UD 013 443

AUTHOR	Quie, Albert H.
TITLE	A New Approach to the Education of the Disadvantaged.
PUB DATE	24 Feb 73
NOTE	22p.; Speech presented to American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Chicago, Ill., February 24, 1973)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Compensatory Education Programs; *Criterion Referenced Tests; *Educational Diagnosis; Educational Needs; Educational Policy; Educational Resources; *Federal Aid; Federal Government; Policy Formation; Program Administration; Public Policy; *Resource Allocations; School Districts
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I

ABSTRACT

Many children who need Title I, Elementary Secondary Education Act services are not getting them in many States because the distribution formula assigns Federal aid on the basis of figures which measure a poor substitute for educational need and then compounds the error by using 14 year old figures. That means that a State is still getting money for a low income child who was in the first grade during the 1960 census and who now has graduated from high school, completed two years of junior college, married, found a job, and is expecting his or her first child. It is fundamentally wrong to continue to aid districts who have long ago lost many of the children whom we have pretended they are serving. Why not actually distribute funds on the basis of actual educational need if that is the condition we are attempting to treat? If we move from a level of income distribution to a level of educational need distribution, I believe we will build a stronger program with a larger constituency and with a better chance of actually showing positive results. It is proposed that a relatively new type of test is administered, the criterion referenced test, to a scientifically drawn national sample. That sample could be used to establish relative needs among the States. Through the use of criterion referenced tests one can avoid making the odious comparing the level of achievement of one child and one school against another. (Author/JM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 074193

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A New Approach To The Education Of The Disadvantaged

by Albert H. Quie
Ranking Member, Committee on Education and Labor
U.S. House of Representatives

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

Chicago, Illinois

February 28, 1973

UD 013463

I would like to express my gratitude for the opportunity to be with you here today. This gathering is representative of two of the most powerful forces in the American system of education -- teachers and those institutions which prepare teachers. The influence which you and your colleagues in teacher training programs have and the potential which exists for even greater impact is esstential to both maintaining and changing our educational system. In a very real way you are the the missionaries upon whom my colleagues and I, as well as those in other areas of education, must depend to maintain and reform our educational system. You are the vital link, the indispensable link, in the system. Before I close today I would like to offer some thoughts on how you can be even more helpful and more influential in shaping education legislation at the State and Federal level.

This convention comes on the eve of what I believe will be one of the most exciting and promising years in higher education in this nation. There are three factors that contribute to my enthusiasm. First, the draft has ended. Now, for the first time in 20 or more years, the young men who enter your institutions will not be there because it offers an escape. True, societal pressure to obtain a sheepskin is still a very real factor in the

lives of many young men and women, regardless of their abilities or interests. But if one thing has emerged as a force among students in the past three to five years it is their ability to withstand social pressures and go their own way. Ofttimes that has meant making sandals or growing somewhat illicit agricultural products, but, as often as not, it has meant that more and more young people are finding satisfaction and contentment in vocations which are not white collar executive positions. I hope that trend continues.

The second factor which I find encouraging is that the so-called fiscal crisis of two and three years ago seems to have stabilized. In many cases situations have actually improved. The dire predictions of 1970 that colleges would be closing by the tens have not materialized. True, there have been some closings. But, the number has been small, and the ones which I know of that have closed have not materially weakened American education through their demise. Colleges have learned how to budget, how to manage money flows and how to deal a bit more effectively with faculty, staff and students. Tuitions do continue to rise, but states are becoming more and more interested in assisting all segments of the higher education community, including nonpublic colleges and universities.

Finally, and the reason for my greatest optimism, we will soon put into operation the newest and most revolutionary program of Federal assistance to postsecondary education since the land grant college bill of the 1860's. The new program is, as many of you know, the basic educational opportunity grant program enacted into law last year as part of the Education Amendments of 1972. This new program should have a revolutionary impact on post-secondary education by guaranteeing every low and middle income student in the nation a specific level of Federal grant aid provided he or she is admitted to an accredited institution of postsecondary education. Although the grants in the beginning years will never exceed one-half of need, it is estimated that between 1 1/2 and 2 million students will be receiving aid by the Fall of 1974.

This new program also represents a major shift in the Federal role in higher education. The trend now is to place funds directly in the hands of the students rather than in the hands of the institution. The effect of this change, which I believe will become even more pronounced in future years, will be to reduce the direct intrusion of the Federal government into the internal affairs of institutions and increase dramatically the degree of competition which exists among institutions. If colleges want

students they will have to offer programs which are much more attractive to their potential clients. The presence of students with Federal funds also has a direct bearing on Federal aid to institutions, if and when that provision should be funded.

The Budget for Higher Education

As to the funding of higher education, the picture has some bright signs. In 1972 total grants from the Office of Education for higher education were $1.24 billion after removal of a one time extra appropriation necessary to place the work study program on a forward funding basis. The President's 1974 budget requests $1.75 billion, an increase of 40% in just two years, and that figure does not include money for VA programs and other forms of Federal student aid such as social security benefits. The increase in student aid funds has been even more dramatic. The total OE appropriation for that purpose in 1972 was $974 million, again removing that lump sum for work study. In 1974 the student aid total will grow, under the President's budget request, nearly 60 percent to $1.534 million.

Now I would be less than candid if I did not admit to you that hidden within those figures are some significant changes which affect graduate education. With a few isolated exceptions most Federal aid for graduate education is being terminated. The major exceptions are certain programs in the sciences run through the National Science Foundation and some programs operated by the Arts and Humanities endowments. The rationale for the termination is quite simple and reflects a conscious decision on the part of the Administration to concentrate its resources and efforts at the undergraduate level with the goal of equalizing access to postsecondary education. The theory behind that decision is that by the time a student receives a basic undergraduate education, he is roughly equal in earning capacity with more affluent students. There is also the quite legitimate concern that continued Federal stimulation of certain graduate programs will only exacerbate a job market situation which is already undesirable.

But all in all, I believe the budget situation is anything but bleak for higher education. With respect to the budget, however, Congress is faced with the vexing issue of how to cope with the President's budget in a way that enhances the power of the

legislative branch. Unquestionably the President is right when he charges that Congress deals with the budget in a piecemeal fashion with no overall perspective. However, there is reason to believe that Congress will soon set its own house in order and find ways to cope with the budget.

A joint House-Senate committee chaired by Rep. Al Ullman of Oregon has been meeting regularly and has issued a set of recommendations which would have each House adopt a total spending ceiling at the beginning of each session. That ceiling would also include targets for each of the dozen or more individual appropriation bills handled each year. To exceed the spending limit on any one bill, a two-thirds majority would have to be mustered. After all appropriation bills had been considered, Congress would consider a final wrap-up bill which would either reduce total appropriations to fit the ceiling or add funds where required. In addition that final bill would carry with it recommendations for tax increases to finance any excess expenditures or would publically admit to the need to increase the national debt by a given amount. I believe that this is the right approach. I endorse it with the firm belief that such a system, if adopted, will actually result in more funds for education. In fact it is the only way we can increase substantially federal funds for education.

Newman Paper on Teacher Education

As many of you may know, the Newman Task Force is preparing a paper on teacher education. I am most intrigued with a recommendation made in a draft version of the task force paper which suggests that the Federal government should encourage the establishment of mission oriented teacher training institutions in contrast to the constituency oriented programs which generally exist now.

The Newman paper on teacher education makes another recommendation which I endorse without reservation; that research and development begin immediately on procedures for awarding teaching credentials on the basis of demonstrated competence with the ultimate goal of credentialing all teachers on the basis of competence.

I think that idea has considerable merit and should be expanded into administrative areas as well. I see little reason to make a school district personnel director or assistant superintendent go through the same credentialing procedures as a second grade teacher. I can see such a movement as having profound and desirable effects on the educational process.

The Need to Strengthen Occupational Education

As many of you know, I have long been an advocate of the need to both increase and upgrade the level of occupational education occuring in the schools. I believe that occupational education takes many forms, from exposure to careers in the lower grades to actual training and on-the-job experience in high school and in postsecondary education.

Two years ago I sponsored a major piece of legislation, the Occupational Education Act, which received strong bi-partisan support in both the Senate and House. That act was included in the Education Amendments of 1972 as part B of Title X of the Higher Education Act. Among its purpose is the development of new and innovative ways to infuse occupational education into the elementary and secondary schools, as well as providing considerable financial support for new programs of occupational education at the post-secondary level.

Unfortunately, the President did not include funds for the Occupational Education Act in his 1974 budget request. However, I intend to work to have those provisions funded and to have new approaches, such as competency certification of occupational education teachers, supported and widely replicated. I would urge

each of you to give serious consideration to changing your own programs to make them flexible enough to accommodate short-term classes for those who enter the teaching profession through the competency certification channel. In addition, I would challenge you to develop other ways of training and retraining teachers of vocational education. I am firmly convinced that HEW Assistant Secretary Sidney Marland is right when he says that the general high school curriculum, which, tragically most often leads nowhere, must be eliminated. In its place must come both wider access to postsecondary education and a much greater emphasis on occupational education which will enable a graduating senior to productively enter the labor market.

Congress Faces ESEA Expiration

As many of you know, the major piece of Federal legislation dealing with our schools, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, is before the Congress this year for extension and revision. Although the law technically expires June 30, there is a clause which is contained in the General Education Provisions Act which will automatically extend the law for an additional year if the Congress has not acted by that date. From my conversations in both the House and the Senate, I fully expect that we will not act before June 30 but rather will take more time to carefully examine the issues and the alternatives.

The House General Education Subcommittee, chaired by Carl Perkins of Kentucky, has already held three weeks of hearings. I expect the Washington portion of those hearings to extend for several more weeks. It is then my hope that we will move to a series of field hearings around the country which will include on-site visitations to schools actively engaged in good programs of compensatory education, of innovation, education for the handicapped and of bilingual education. All wisdom most certainly does not reside in Washington and most of it doesn't even come to visit. If we want to write a bill which will be useful to the vast majority of schools and children we must broaden our own experiences and exposure to what is happening in our schools.

Within the past several weeks I have been engaged in the preparation of a new bill which I hope will be substituted for Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Since ESEA was first passed in 1965, I have been concerned over the fact that the distribution formula for Title I is based on what I consider to be a poor surrogate for educational need -- low family income. In substantiation of that concern I would refer you to a 1970 study done by G.V. Glass, Data Analysis of the 1968-1969 Survey of Compensatory Education, in which the author cites

figures for the distribution of educational deficiencies by income bracket. His study shows, for example, that only 21 per cent of the children with reading deficiencies are in the below $3,000 income bracket. An additional 44 per cent are in the $3-6,000 bracket with the remaining 35% falling above $6,000. In math the distribution is quite similar. Since we are still distributing funds by counting those students whose family income falls below $2,000, as well as those with AFDC payments above $2,000, we are probably not even reaching the minimum figure which I cited of 21 per cent of the children with deficiencies in reading and mathematics. Personally, I find that situation indefensible.

As I noted, in 1973 we are still using census figures for the distribution of Title I money. Those census figures are now nearly 14 years old. In fact, when we began to use those figures they were already six years out of date. Even if we move to 1970 census figures for fiscal 1974 the income information data will already be five years obsolete. The preliminary figures which I have seen from the 1970 census are most interesting. As I predicted, the figures show that the country has undergone tremendous population shifts since the 1960 census. If one uses the $2,000 income level which is currently used for distribution of Title I monies, you will

find that nationally we have 47 per cent fewer families in that income level than in 1960. Even more important, several states have lost far more than the national average. My own state of Minnesota has declined 59 per cent. North Carolina, the biggest loser, has lost 69 per cent. Other states, notably California, Connecticut and Nevada have actually gained low income population. The Nevada gain alone is almost 25 per cent.

What this all means is that many children who need services are not getting them in many states because the distribution formula assigns Federal aid on the basis of figures which measure a poor substitute for educational need and then compounds the error by using 14 year old figures. Remember, that means that a state is still getting money for a low income child who was in the first grade during the 1960 census and who now has graduated from high school, completed 2 years of junior college, married, found a job and is expecting his or her first child! I believe that it is fundamentally wrong to continue to aid districts who have long ago lost many of the children whom we have pretended they are serving.

A New Approach to Compensatory Education

At this point you are certainly entitled to ask me what I would suggest as a better method if I find income so unacceptable for use in the Title I formula. My answer is, why not actually distribute funds on the basis of actual educational need if that is the condition we are attempting to treat? If we move from a level of income distribution to a level of educational need distribution, I believe we will build a stronger program with a larger constituency and with a better chance of actually showing positive results.

During the last several months, I have examined rather carefully the potential for moving to a system of testing which could be used for the distribution of Title I funds. I am convinced that the skills and talents are there for such a move and that the educational public would welcome such a change. I do not suggest that we test every child in the nation using one of the so-called standard achievement tests. Rather, I propose that we administer a relatively new type of test, the criterion referenced test, to a scientifically drawn national sample. That sample could be used to establish relative needs among the states. To those who might doubt our abilities to accomplish such a task, I cite the experiences of the National Assessment and some very interesting work now going on in many states, including Michigan, which I shall return to in a moment.

I have chosen to put my faith in criterion referenced tests because I believe that through their use we can best escape the onus of comparing the level of achievement of one child and one school against another. If we accept as a Federal responsibility the preparation of a child to function in everyday society, to prepare that boy or girl to read a newspaper, interpret roadsigns and maps, make change in the grocery store and figure the number of hours worked in a week, then we can avoid the critics who worry about relative content of curricula, teaching styles, etc. I believe that we can arrive at national objectives, as valid in Alaska as they are in Florida, for the basic education of our young people. If we confine both the objectives and the measurement of those objectives to language arts and mathematics, we can avoid the problem plagued areas of social studies, citizenship, psychology and hard sciences, I recognize them as problems plagued because they are much more affected by state curricula and local choice.

If we move to a system that provides money to a state for every student who needs help, I believe we will also remove many of the administrative problems that currently befall the Title I program. We would also solve the vexing problem facing school districts under court orders to disperse their minority students

equally among the schools; a fact that can result in the loss of Title I money because of the requirement in the Title I regulations to concentrate on those areas with the highest concentration of low income families. Once the funds reach a state, I would propose that the state be permitted to devise its own method of intra-state distribution, so long as that method measures actual educational need.

To this point what I have talked about has been fairly technical--formulas, census figures, testing, etc. From this point on the proposal which I am considering becomes far more concerned with what a child learns and how his or her school goes about providing the remedial services which that student may require.

The Need to Individualize Instruction

Once the individual school receives its funds, based on a measure of actual need, then that school should have the responsibility for determining actual performance levels for a student and should be required to establish realistic goals for that year with the active participation of the parent, teacher, and child.

Earlier, I mentioned my interest in a program currently in operation in Michigan. The Michigan program follows the same lines of reasoning which I have sketched. Michigan is in the process of developing a criterion referenced test to be used by the state for the distribution of state funds for the educationally disadvantaged.

Michigan takes things even one step further. There the law requires that after individual student goals have been established, then the school is expected to increase that student's actual level of performance .75 years for every year he or she is in the program. If the schools do not produce, their funding under the program is proportionally reduced. In some cities, such as Flint, students actually enter into a contract with the school and with the participation of the parents which spells out the responsibilities of each party.

Hopefully, a conscious effort to individualize instruction will move us rapidly toward a period when we can tailor an educational program for each child. I once heard, if we manufactured shoes the way we educate children, we would find out the average size and then manufacture only that size. As one who wears a size 14 shoe, I would find that as uncomfortable as a child who finds most schools wholly unable to cope with his particular needs and abilities.

Two preliminary results of the Michigan program are most encouraging. In some areas actual level of achievement has increased as much as 1.5 years in a single year. In Detroit, where educational performance had steadily fallen for several years, the line of performance is moving in the other direction. Detroit has actually closed the reading gap for fourth grade students from 10 months below the national average to six months below the national average.

There are, of course, other excellent samples of programs of superior success in dealing with educational disadvantage. My own state of Minnesota has launched a reading program which I believe to be the finest in the country. One of the key components in the Minnesota program is an intensive 240 hour program of in-service training for teachers. Patterson, New Jersey, has achieved excellent results with a program which extensively involves parents in both the establishment of individual goals and with the achievement of those goals. The Kettering Foundation and Research for Better Schools have been quite successful in getting schools to adopt approaches to individualized instruction.

All things considered, I believe that the time is right for the Federal government to add its approval and its leadership to this trend. From what I have seen and heard, the results may be revolutionary, as indeed they should be.

Hand in hand with any major change will be the need to revitalize and reanalyze teacher training programs, both within schools and within colleges and universities. Teachers will need to learn more about criterion referenced testing, how to accurately and fully diagnose the needs of a student, how to design an individual program of remediation, how to measure progress, how to report progress, and how to involve parents as full and effective partners in this new approach to basic learning.

Teachers in the Political Process

Finally, as I mentioned earlier, I would like to offer a suggestion or two which I hope will result in a greater degree of participation by teachers and those who train teachers in the decision making process in Washington and in your own state capitals.

To me, one of the more discouraging omissions from our consideration of comprehensive higher education legislation last year was the lack of any input, or even any interest, from the professors in our colleges and universities. Within the next year or so, as I mentioned earlier, Congress will be almost literarlly wrestling with the problems and the challenges of Federal legislation to amend and extend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Again, I find no specific indication of interest by teachers, or those who train teachers, in the issues under consideration. I am aware, of course, of the sentiments expressed by both the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers. However, that is not the kind of expertise and interest I am looking for. We need to hear from those of you who have had experience in good programs of individualized instruction as well as those who can discourse with us about the Federal role in education and how well the laws already in existence and funded have worked. I would like to see a few selected groups of teachers come to Washington and talk with those of us who will be dealing with these issues.

I would also like to hear from the trainers of teachers. But, when I hear from you I would like to know that you have actually spent some time recently in the classroom in an elementary school or a high school. I was interested in an article in a recent edition of a university newspaper in the midwest which quoted a number of faculty who had served as substitute teachers for a few days. One was quoted as saying, "It wasn't easy, and I suppose that's why its worthwhile. We owe teachers a great deal more respect and consideration than we give them for the patience and understanding they have in working with children."

The dean of the school of education remarked "I'm under the impression that somehow we ought to require this kind of participation by as many of our university people as possible. I'm not sure how much that we do equips people to operate in the everyday world." I hope that dean succeeds in imposing that new requirement!

I have enjoyed being with you both last evening and this morning. The proposal I spoke of earlier will be introduced as a new piece of legislation very shortly. I would like to hear your reactions to that proposal and I hope that I will very soon notice a heightened degree of interest in this group and within classroom teacher groups in what happens in Washington.